



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides.* By HARRY MORTIMER HUBBELL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913. Pp. 72. \$1.25.

This Yale dissertation, which was written under the direction of Professor Hendrickson, is an interesting study in the field of ancient rhetoric. The title is somewhat misleading, for judging from it the reader would naturally expect to find some discussion of the influence of Isocratean style and rhythm on the writers designated, whereas the author limits himself to a treatment of Isocrates' theories as to the purpose of oratory and the powers of the orator and the influence exerted by these teachings on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides. This limitation, however, is quite justifiable inasmuch as the specific question of the influence of Isocrates' style has been treated more or less thoroughly by others.

An introduction of a few pages sketches the twofold activity of the Sophists as students and teachers of rhetoric (both practical and purely artistic) and also as exponents of an encyclopedic education. The special interests and achievements of Protagoras, Gorgias, Isocrates, and Plato are mentioned and correctly characterized, although it is surely an overstatement to declare (p. xi) that "the success of Isocrates as a perfecter of style *has obscured* the fact that he continued the encyclopedic education of the sophists of the fifth century." The rivalry and conflict between philosophy and rhetoric is next indicated, a quarrel seen first most clearly in the writings of Plato and Isocrates, which ended in the triumph of philosophy and the limitation of rhetoric to a study of style and argument. But in the first century B.C. an attempt was made to restore rhetoric to its former high estate and to enrich it by making philosophy ancillary to it. Now the purpose of this dissertation under review is to "trace this influence on some representatives of the revival of the early conception of rhetorical education."

The chapters devoted to Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides are prefaced by a presentation of Isocrates' views of the purpose of oratory and the powers of the orator. For the correct understanding of this teaching it is necessary to arrive at an accurate definition of several important and often-repeated terms which are used in a peculiarly Isocratean sense. Of these *φιλοσοφία* and *ιδέα* are the most important. In explanation of the former term the following references may be added to the list on p. 1: *Panegy.* 10. *Busir.* 49. *Evag.* 8. *Panath.* 209. *Phil.* 84. *Antid.* 270. The interpretation of *ιδέα* (pp. 6-7) is, I think, correct. In the passages cited (p. 9) wherein Isocrates lays claim to originality, add the following: *Panegy.* 4 and 9. *Ad Nic.* 41. *Evag.* 7-8. *Helen* 13. *Adv. Soph.* 12. *Phil.* 93-94. Finally, in this summing up of the aims of the moral teachings of Isocrates his interesting characterization of the educated man (*Panath.* 30 ff.) should be included, although there are references to this passage subsequently.

In the chapter on Cicero (pp. 16-40) it is the author's aim "to show that Cicero derived from Isocrates the idea of the function of the orator which he

presents in the *De Oratore*." The discussion naturally begins with the quotation of the well-known passage quoted by Piderit (p. 12), in his edition, and Laurand (see below): "*scripsi igitur . . . tres libros . . . de oratore, . . . abhorrent enim a communibus praeceptis atque omnem antiquorum, et Aristoteliam et Isocrateam, rationem oratoriam complectuntur*" (Ad. Fam. i. 9). Next are tabulated the numerous passages in which Cicero expresses profound admiration for Isocrates and those which seem to be direct quotations from him, and finally Cicero's ideal of an orator. With these Ciceronian passages are compared the teachings of Isocrates which are of similar tenor, and the claim is made that Cicero's theory is based, in general, on that of the Attic orator. And in the reviewer's opinion the claim is valid and is substantiated in many important points. The author's thesis in this chapter, however, is as follows: "I hope to show that Cicero's debt to Isocrates is not merely in rhythm and style, as has commonly been supposed, but that his whole attitude toward oratory as an art is drawn from Isocrates." Now it is true that some writers, e.g., Kroll (*Cicero und die Rhetorik*, Neue Jahrb., 1903, p. 684) and Ammon (cited by H.) do not regard Isocrates (particularly his τέχνη) as a possible source for Cicero, but Laurand (*De M. Tulli Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis*, Paris, 1907, pp. 26-31), whose dissertation apparently is unknown to the author, discusses this very question and comes to the conclusion: "*et re quidem vera Ciceronis doctrina rhetorica cum Isocratea in quibusdam notatione dignis consentit, . . .*" and these points of agreement are not merely in matters of style and rhythm but in other important particulars included in Cicero's "*omnem Isocrateam rationem oratoriam*." It may be said at once, however, that Dr. Hubbell's treatment is far more extensive and thorough than that of Laurand.

In the chapter on Dionysius of Halicarnassus (pp. 41-53) it is shown that Dionysius was a devoted follower of the older school of rhetoric of which Isocrates is a conspicuous representative and that in his writings, particularly in the *Essay on Isocrates*, admiration and approval are expressed by Dionysius for the Isocratean rhetoric-philosophy.

The Isocratean tradition was renewed in the second century A.D. in the attitude of the rhetorician-sophist, Aristides (pp. 54-64), who, in the war which had long been waged between the rhetoricians and the philosophers, fights vigorously in defense of rhetoric.

The dissertation unfortunately contains no bibliography and no index. It is attractively printed and nicely, though simply, bound. It is to be feared, however, that the price, which seems too high, may militate against its wide dissemination among classical students in general, who might otherwise purchase it.

In conclusion it may be said that the dissertation is a careful piece of work and an interesting presentation of material.

LA RUE VAN HOOK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY